arXiv:hep-th/9405074v1 11 May 1994

Twistor–like Formulation of D=10, type IIA, Superstrings *

P. Pasti and M. Tonin

Dipartimento di Fisica "G. Galilei" – Università di Padova

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare - Sezione di Padova

Padova (Italy)

Abstract. The twistor–like formulation of the type IIA superstring σ–model in D=10 is obtained by performing a dimensional reduction of the recently proposed twistor–like action of the supermembrane in D=11. The superstring action is invariant under local, worldsheet (n, n) supersymmetry where $3 \leq n \leq 8$ and is classical equivalent to the standard Green–Schwarz action (at least for $n = 8$)

(*) Supported in part by M.P.I. This work is carried out in the framework of the European Community Research Programme "Gauge Theories, applied supersymmetry and quantum gravity" with a financial contribution under contract SC1-CT92-D789.

DFPD/94/TH/05 **January 1994**

1 – INTRODUCTION

Recently some attention has been devoted to new formulations [1]–[14] of superparticles, Green–Schwarz superstrings and, in general, super–branes that involve twistor–like [15] or harmonic variables [16]. The motivation of these attempts is the hope to clarify the role of the κ–symmetry in these models and to have some insight on the problem of their covariant quantization.

In particular, the twistor–like approach, with manifest world manifold supersymmetry, first proposed by Sorokin et al. [1] for superparticles in D=3,4, has been worked successfully for σ–models of superparticles [6], heterotic strings [4],[5],[7],[9] in D=3,4,6,10 and supermembranes [12] in D=11. Moreover type II superstrings have been considered by Chikalov and Pashnev [10] in D=4 with (1,0) world sheet supersymmetry and by Galperin and Sokatchev [11] in D=3 with (1,1) world sheet supersymmetry. Recently a formulation of heterotic string with both Virasoro constraints solved in twistor form has been presented [13]. The approach of ref. [12] has been also extended to other p–branes by Bergshoeff and Sezgin [14].

The target space background of these σ–models fulfils the same constraints that implement the κ–symmetry in the standard formulations. In particular, for superparticles, D=10 heterotic strings and D=11 supermembranes, these background constraints force the SYM and/or SUGRA background to be on shell.

Moreover the embedding of the d–dimensional world supermanifold into the D–dimensional target superspace is restricted by the "twistor constraint": the components of the pull–back of the vector supervielbeins along the fermionic directions of the world supermanifold tangent space vanish.

Thank to these background and twistor constraints, the background two superform B which is present in these models, exhibits a remarkable property, called Weyl triviality. This property is crucial to get actions with a manifest, world manifold n–extended local supersymmetry. This supersymmetry replaces n–components (and therefore provides a geometrical meaning) of the κ–symmetry of the standard formulations.

In this paper we pursue the program of the twistor–like approach by presenting a twistor–like classical action for the D=10, type IIA, superstrings σ–model. Our action exhibits left–handed and right–handed, n–extended, world–sheet local supersymmetry where $3 \leq n \leq 8$ and is classically equivalent to the standard G.S. action.

For our purposes, twistors are just commuting Majorana spinors, λ, (Weyl–

Majorana in D=10) in a space–time with Minkowski signature. Their usefulness in twistor–like models is mainly due to the fact that in D=3,4,6,10 dimensions, the vector $v^{\underline{a}} = \lambda\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\lambda$ is automatically light–like. This follows from the cyclic identity of the Γ–matrices in these dimensions. So in the case of heterotic strings, the twistor condition $\mathcal{E}_{-}^{\underline{a}} = \lambda\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\lambda$ implies the Virasoro constraint $\mathcal{E}_{-}^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_{-\underline{a}} = 0$ ($\mathcal{E}_{\pm}^{\underline{a}}$ are the left–handed and right–handed components of the pullback of the target vector–like supervielbeins). If one tries to repeat the same strategy for type II superstrings one meets a difficulty. Indeed the twistor constraint in this case gives

$$\mathcal{E}_{-}^{\underline{a}} = \lambda\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\lambda + \bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{\lambda}$$

and a similar relation for $\mathcal{E}_{+}^{\underline{a}}$. Here λ, $\bar{\lambda}$ are two independent twistors (of opposite chirality for type IIA superstrings) so that the Virasoro constraints for $\mathcal{E}_{\pm}^{\underline{a}}$ are not guaranted. In our model this difficulty is overcome by the same mechanism at work for D=11 supermembranes. The point is that the worldsheet metric induced by the target supervielbeins $E^{\underline{a}}$ does not coincide with the metric specified by the preferred local frame where the n–extended worldsheet supersymmetry manifests itself. In other words the Virasoro constraints do not appear in this local frame but in a different one.

The simplest way to get the correct constraints for the D=10, twistor–like, type IIA, superstrings is to perform a dimensional reduction of the D=11, supermembrane model of ref. [12], along the line of ref. [17]. This is done in section 2. In section 3 we derive some useful identities that follow from these constraints and we show that the property of Weyl triviality is satisfied. Finally in section 4 we write the action and we prove that it is classically equivalent to the standard Green–Schwarz action.

Our notations are these of ref. [12]. In particular we shall follow the convention of ref. [9] to use the same letters for the world manifold and target space indices and to make the distinction by underlining the target space ones. Moreover in order to distinguish between D=11 and D=10 quantities and/or indices we shall put a hat on the former.

An appendix collects our conventions about Γ matrices in D=11 and their reduction in D=10 dimensions.

2 – DIMENSIONAL REDUCTION

The supermembrane superworld volume $\mathcal{M}(3|2n)$ is described by the local coordinates

$$\hat{\zeta}^{\hat{\mathcal{M}}} \equiv (\xi^{\hat{m}}, \eta^{q\mu}); \quad \hat{m} = 0, 1, 2;\ \mu = 1, 2;\ q = 1, ...n$$

where $\eta^{q\mu}$ are grassmann variables. We shall also use the notation

$$\xi^{\pm} = \xi^0 \pm \xi^1 \quad \xi^2 = \rho$$

The superstring superworldsheet $\mathcal{M}(2|n,n)$ is the slide of $\mathcal{M}(3|2n)$ at $\rho = 0$. The dimensional reduction of the worldmanifold is obtained by restricting all the superfields to be independent from ρ and by setting:

$$\hat{e}^{\pm} = e^{\pm}(\zeta) \tag{2.1a}$$

$$\hat{e}^{q\alpha} = e^{q\alpha}(\zeta) + \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}^{\perp}\sigma_{\perp}^{\alpha\beta}D^{q}_{\beta}\psi(\zeta) \tag{2.1b}$$

$$\hat{e}^{\perp} = e^{-\psi(\zeta)}(d\rho + h(\zeta)) \tag{2.1c}$$

where $\zeta^{M} = (\xi^{\pm}, \eta^{q\mu})$, $\sigma^{\perp}_{\alpha\beta}$ is the matrix $\left(\begin{smallmatrix}0 & 1\\ 1 & 0\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ (and $\sigma_{\perp}^{\alpha\beta}$ is its inverse) and $h = e^{+}h_{+} + e^{-}h_{-} + e^{q\alpha}h_{q\alpha}$. The one–superforms $\hat{e}^{\hat{A}}, (\hat{A} = \pm, \perp, q\alpha)$ and $e^{A}, (A = \pm, q\alpha)$ are the d=3 and d=2 supervielbeins respectively. Their duals are the vector superfields $\hat{D}_{\hat{A}}$ and D_{A}. The d=2 torsion is

$$\mathcal{T}^{A} = \Delta e^{A} = de^{A} + e^{B}\omega_{B}{}^{A}$$

where $\omega_{B}{}^{A}$ is a connection of the structure group $SO(1,1)\otimes SO(n)$. With eqs. (2-1) and a suitable choice of the reduction–redefinition of the connections, the d=3 constraints, as given in [12], give rise to the standard, d=2, torsion constraints:

$$\mathcal{T}^{\pm} = e^{q\alpha}e^{\beta}_{q}\sigma^{\pm}_{\alpha\beta}$$

The expression of the torsion $\mathcal{T}^{q\alpha}$ will not be needed in the following and will not be reported here. It is only useful to recall the Bianchi identity

$$e^{q\alpha}e^{p\beta}e^{r\gamma}\mathcal{T}_{q\alpha,p\beta}{}^{s\delta}\sigma^{\pm}_{\delta\gamma}\delta_{rs} = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

The supermembrane target superspace, $\underline{\mathcal{M}}(11|32)$, is described by the local supercoordinates:

$$\hat{Z}^{\underline{\hat{M}}} \equiv (X^{\underline{\hat{m}}}, \theta^{\underline{\hat{\mu}}}); \quad \underline{\hat{m}} = 0, 1...10; \quad \underline{\hat{\mu}} = 1, ...32.$$

We shall write $X^{10} = Y$ and we shall identify Y with the world volume coordinate ρ. Moreover a Majorana spinor in D=11 decomposes in two Weyl–Majorana spinors in D=10 with opposite chirality. Then the string coordinates are

$$Z^{\underline{M}} \equiv (X^{\underline{m}}, \theta^{\underline{\mu}}, \bar{\theta}_{\underline{\mu}}) \quad \underline{m} = 0, 1, ...9; \quad \underline{\mu} = 1, ...16$$

and $\hat{Z}^{\underline{M}} \equiv (Z^{\underline{M}}, Y)$. We assume that all the background superfields do not depend on Y.

In D=11 the reonomic parametrizations of the torsion $\hat{T}^{\underline{\hat{A}}}$ and of the B–curvature $\hat{H} = d\hat{B}$ are given by

$$\hat{T}^{\underline{\hat{a}}} = \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{\beta}}} \Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{\underline{\hat{\beta}}\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} \tag{2.3a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{T}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} = & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{\beta}}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}} \Big\{ F_{\underline{\hat{a}}\underline{\hat{b}}_1 \underline{\hat{b}}_2 \underline{\hat{b}}_3} (\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{b}_1 \underline{b}_2 \underline{b}_3})_{\underline{\hat{\beta}}}{}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} - \frac{1}{8} F_{\underline{b}_1 \cdots \underline{b}_4} (\hat{\Gamma}_{\underline{\hat{a}}}{}^{\underline{\hat{b}}_1 \cdots \underline{\hat{b}}_4})_{\underline{\hat{\beta}}}{}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} \Big\} + \\ & + \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{b}}} \; \rho_{\underline{\hat{b}\hat{a}}}{}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}}\end{aligned} \tag{2.3b}$$

$$\hat{H} = \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{\beta}}} E^{\underline{\hat{b}}} E^{\underline{\hat{a}}} \Big(\hat{\Gamma}_{\underline{\hat{a}\hat{b}}} \Big)_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}} + \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{b}}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{c}}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{d}}} F_{\underline{\hat{a}\hat{b}\hat{c}\hat{d}}} \tag{2.3c}$$

The D=10 supervielbeins E^A, the Lorentz superconnection $\Omega_A{}^B$ and the two–superform B are obtained from the corresponding superforms in D=11 by dimensional reduction. To this end we restrict all the target superfields to be independent on Y and we set:

$$\hat{E}^{\underline{a}} = \bar{e}^{\phi} E^a \tag{2.4a}$$

$$\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} = e^{-\phi/2} \Big(E^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} + \frac{1}{2} E^{\underline{b}} \Gamma_{\underline{b}}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}} \Delta_{\underline{\hat{\beta}}} \phi \Big) - e^{\phi/2} \hat{E}^{\underline{10}} \Gamma_{\underline{10}}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}} \Delta_{\underline{\hat{\beta}}} \phi \tag{2.4b}$$

$$\hat{E}^{\underline{10}} = e^{2\phi} (E^{\underline{10}} + dY) = e^{-\phi} (A + e^{\tilde{\psi}} \hat{e}^{\perp}) \tag{2.4c}$$

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} = \Omega_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} + X_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} \tag{2.4d}$$

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\underline{10}}{}^{\underline{b}} = X_{\underline{10}}{}^{\underline{b}} \tag{2.4e}$$

$$B = dZ^{\underline{M}} dZ^{\underline{N}} B_{\underline{NM10}} \tag{2.4f}$$

where

$$E^{\underline{a}} = dZ^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}}(Z); \quad E^{\underline{10}} = dZ^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{10}}(Z)$$

$$E^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} = dZ^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}}(Z) = (E^{\underline{\alpha}}, \bar{E}_{\underline{\alpha}})$$

$$A = e^{3\phi}(E^{\underline{10}} - h)$$

$$\tilde{\psi} = \psi + 3\phi$$

$X_{\underline{10}}^{\underline{b}}$ and $X^{\underline{ab}} = -X^{\underline{ba}}$ are Lorentz covariant one–superforms, and $\phi(Z)$ is the dilaton.

One can see that a suitable choice of $X_{\underline{10}}{}^{\underline{b}}$ and $X_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}}$ and the identification of $F_{\underline{\hat{a}}_1 \ldots \underline{\hat{a}}_4}$ and $\rho_{\underline{\hat{a}\hat{b}}}^{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}}$ in eq. (2.3b) with higher components of the superfield $\phi(Z)$ allow to bring to zero the flat components of the torsion and Lorentz curvature along $\hat{E}^{\underline{10}}$. Of course the dimensional reduction is specified modulo a redefinition of the D=10 supervielbeins and Lorentz connection and the choice in eqs. (2.2)–(2.4) is taken to recover the standard D=10 constraints[18]. They are:

$$T_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}^{\underline{a}} = 2\Gamma_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}^{\underline{a}}; \quad T^{\underline{a}\alpha\beta} = 2\Gamma^{\underline{a\alpha}\beta} \tag{2.5a}$$

$$T_{\underline{\beta\gamma}}{}^{\alpha} = -3\Big(\delta_{\underline{\beta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} \Delta_{\underline{\gamma}}\phi - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{\underline{\beta\gamma}}^{\underline{b}} \Gamma_{\underline{b}}^{\underline{\alpha\delta}} \Delta_{\underline{\delta}}\phi\Big), \tag{2.5b}$$

$$T^{\underline{\beta\gamma}}{}_{\underline{\alpha}} = -3\Big(\delta_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\underline{\beta}} \Delta^{\underline{\gamma}}\phi - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{\underline{b}}^{\underline{\beta}\gamma} \Gamma_{\underline{\alpha\delta}}^{\underline{b}} \bar{\Delta}^{\underline{\delta}}\phi\Big) \tag{2.5c}$$

$$H_{\underline{a\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = \Gamma_{\underline{a\alpha}\underline{\beta}}; \quad H_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = -\Gamma_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\alpha\beta}} \tag{2.5d}$$

$$T_{\underline{bc}}^{\underline{a}} = 0 \tag{2.5e}$$

and all the other torsion and curvature components in the sectors of dimensions 0, 1/2, vanish. One should notice that the torsion components in eqs. (2.5 a,b,c) fulfil the Bianchi identity:

$$T^{\underline{\delta}}_{(\underline{\beta\gamma}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha})\underline{\delta}} = 0 \tag{2.6}$$

Here and in the following, indices between round brackets (square brackets) are symmetrized (antisymmetrized).

The pullback of $\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{A}}}$ and $E^{\underline{A}}$ are respectively

$$\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{A}}} = \hat{e}^{+}\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{A}}}_{+} + \hat{e}^{-}\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{A}}}_{-} + \hat{e}^{\perp}\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{A}}}_{\perp} + \hat{e}^{q\alpha}\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{A}}}_{q\alpha}$$

$$E^{\underline{A}} = e^{+}E^{\underline{A}}_{+} + e^{-}E^{\underline{A}}_{-} + e^{q\alpha}E^{\underline{A}}_{q\alpha}$$

Then from eqs. (2.1) and (2.4 a,b,c) one has

$$\hat{E}^{\underline{a}}_{A} = e^{-\phi}E^{\underline{a}}_{A}$$

$$\hat{E}^{\underline{10}}_{A} = A_{A}; \quad \hat{E}^{\underline{10}}_{\perp} = e^{-\phi}e^{\tilde{\psi}}$$

The twistor constraint for the supermembrane is

$$\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{q\alpha} = 0 \tag{2.7}$$

and the spinor–like derivative of this condition gives

$$\left(\hat{E}_{q\alpha}\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}\hat{E}_{p\beta}\right) = \delta_{pq}\left[\sigma^{+}_{\alpha\beta}\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{+} + \sigma^{-}_{\alpha\beta}\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{-} + \sigma^{\perp}_{\alpha\beta}\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{\perp}\right] \tag{2.8}$$

From eqs. (2.1) and (2.7) one gets

$$\hat{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\perp} = 0$$

Moreover eq. (2.7) gives for the superstring the expected twistor constraint:

$$E^{\underline{a}}_{q\alpha} = 0 \tag{2.9}$$

and the spinor–like derivative of eq. (2.9) (i.e. eq. (2.8) restricted to D=10) yields

$$\delta_{qp}E^{\underline{a}}_{+} = (E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{p1}) + (\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p1}) \tag{2.10a}$$

$$\delta_{qp}E^{\underline{a}}_{-} = (E_{q2}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{p2}) + (\bar{E}_{q2}\Gamma^{a}\bar{E}_{p2}) \tag{2.10b}$$

$$0 = (E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{p2}) + (\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p2}) \tag{2.10c}$$

However eq. (2.8), taken for $\underline{\hat{a}} = \underline{10}$, contains the further constraints

$$(\bar{E}_{(q1}E_{p1)}) = \delta_{qp}A_{+} \tag{2.11a}$$

$$(\bar{E}_{(q2}E_{p2)}) = \delta_{qp}A_{-} \tag{2.11b}$$

$$(\bar{E}_{q1}E_{p2}) + (\bar{E}_{p2}E_{q1}) = \delta_{qp}e^{\tilde{\psi}} \tag{2.11c}$$

In conclusion as twistor constraints for the superstring we shall impose both eq. (2.9) and eqs. (2.11). They will be obtained through lagrangian multipliers by means of the action term:

$$I^{(C)} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{e}P^{q\alpha}_{\underline{a}}E^{\underline{a}}_{q\alpha} + \int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{e}Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}(\bar{E}_{q\alpha}E_{p\beta}) \tag{2.12}$$

where $Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}$ is symmetric in $(q\alpha), (p\beta)$ and traceless with respect to q, p, and $\tilde{e}$ is the superdeterminant of e^{A}_{M}.

2 – RELEVANT IDENTITIES AND WEYL TRIVIALITY

As shown in [12], in the case of the supermembrane the twistor constraint implies the remarkable identities

$$V^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{(qp)[\hat{a}\hat{b}]} = \delta_{qp}V^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{[\hat{a}\hat{b}]} \tag{3.1}$$

$$V^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{(qp)(\hat{a}\hat{b})} = 0 \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$V^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{(qp)\hat{a}\hat{b}}\hat{E}_{\underline{\hat{a}}\hat{c}} = \delta_{qp}\epsilon_{\hat{a}\hat{b}\hat{c}}\sqrt{det\ \hat{g}} \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$V^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{(qp)\hat{a}\hat{b}} = \frac{1}{4}\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\hat{a}}\sigma^{\gamma\delta}_{\hat{b}}\left(\hat{E}_{\alpha q}\Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}\hat{b}}}\hat{E}_{\beta p}\right)\left(\hat{E}_{\gamma r}\Gamma_{\hat{b}}\hat{E}^{r}_{\delta}\right) \tag{3.4}$$

Here $q, p = 1, ..., n$; $3 \leq n \leq 8$ and $\hat{a}, \hat{b} = \pm, \perp$.

Moreover

$$\hat{g}_{\hat{a}\hat{b}} = \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{\hat{a}} \eta_{\underline{\hat{a}}\underline{\hat{b}}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{b}}}_{\hat{b}} \tag{3.5}$$

is the metric induced by the target vielbeins $\hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}$ in the tangent space of the world volume. We shall assume that this metric is non degenerate.

Let us consider the projectors

$$\hat{Q}^{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \hat{\bar{\Gamma}})$$

where

$$\hat{\bar{\Gamma}} = \frac{\epsilon^{\hat{a}\hat{b}\hat{c}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{\hat{a}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{b}}}_{\hat{b}} \hat{E}^{\underline{\hat{c}}}_{\hat{c}} \Gamma_{\underline{\hat{a}\hat{b}\hat{c}}}}{6\sqrt{det\ \hat{g}}} \tag{3.6}$$

and let us write

$$\hat{v}^{(\pm)} = \hat{Q}^{\pm} \hat{v}$$

where $\hat{v}$ is a D=11 spinor. It is also convenient to split the Γ–matrices as

$$\Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}} = \Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{=} + \Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{\perp}$$

where $\Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{=}$ lives in the three dimensional subspace spanned by $E^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{a}$ and $\Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{\perp}$ lives in the eight dimensional orthogonal subspace. Notice that

$$(\hat{v}^{(\pm)} \Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{\perp} \hat{v}^{(\pm)}) = 0 = (\hat{v}^{(\pm)} \Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{=} \hat{v}^{(\mp)})$$

Eq. (3.3) is equivalent to the following condition

$$(\hat{E}^{(-)}_{(q\alpha} \Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}} \hat{E}_{p\beta)}) = 0 \tag{3.7}$$

that is

$$\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{a} (\hat{E}^{(-)}_{(q\alpha} \Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{=} \hat{E}^{(-)}_{p\beta)}) = 0 \tag{3.8}$$

$$\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{a} (\hat{E}^{(-)}_{(q\alpha} \Gamma^{\underline{\hat{a}}}_{\perp} \hat{E}^{(+)}_{p\beta)}) = 0 \tag{3.9}$$

After dimensional reduction from D=11 to D=10, eq. (3.3) yields the identities

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big[(\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p1}) - (E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{p1})\Big]E_{-\underline{a}} = \\ &= \Big[(E_{q2}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{p2}) - (\bar{E}_{q2}\Gamma^{a}\bar{E}_{p2})\Big]E_{+\underline{a}} = \delta_{qp}(-det\ g)^{1/2}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\Big[(E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{p2}) + (E_{q2}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{p1}) - (\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p2}) - (\bar{E}_{q2}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p1})\Big](A_+E^{\underline{a}}_- - A_-E^{\underline{a}}_+) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\Big[(E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{ab}}\bar{E}_{p2}) + (E_{q2}\Gamma^{\underline{ab}}\bar{E}_{p1})\Big]E_{+\underline{a}}E_{-\underline{b}} = e^{\tilde{\psi}}\delta_{qp}(-det\ g)^{1/2}\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

and eq. (3.7) gives

$$(E^{(-)}_{(q\alpha}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{p\beta)}) + (\bar{E}^{(-)}_{(q\alpha}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p\beta)}) = 0 \tag{3.12}$$

Here

$$g_{ab} = E^{\underline{a}}_{a}\eta_{\underline{ab}}E^{\underline{b}}_{b} \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$E^{(\pm)}_{q\alpha} = Q^{\pm}E_{q\alpha}; \quad \bar{E}^{(\pm)}_{q\alpha} = Q^{\pm}\bar{E}_{q\alpha} \tag{3.14}$$

with

$$Q^{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{(1 \pm E^{\underline{a}}_{+}E^{\underline{b}}_{-}\Gamma_{\underline{ab}})}{(det\ g)^{1/2}} \tag{3.15}$$

Moreover eqs. (3.2), (3.4), taken for $\hat{a} = \hat{b} = \perp$ and $q = p$ together with eq. (2.11c) imply

$$\Big[(E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{q2}) - (\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{q2})\Big] = 0 \tag{3.16}$$

so that, by taking into account eq. (2.10c), one has

$$(E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{q2}) = 0 = (\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{q2}) \tag{3.17}$$

Of course these identities can be derived directly from the twistor constraints in D=10.

Indeed let us consider the vector

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\underline{a}}_q = {} & (E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{ab}}\bar{E}_{q1})E_{-\underline{b}} + (E_{q2}\Gamma^{\underline{ab}}\bar{E}_{q2})E_{+\underline{b}} - \Big[(E_{2q}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{2q}) - (\bar{E}_{2q}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{2q})\Big]A_{+} - \\ & - [(E_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{q1}) - (\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{q1})]A_{-} \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Then a straightforward calculation, which makes use of the constraints (2.10), (2.11) and of the Γ–matrix cyclic identity, allows to rewrite $V^{\underline{a}}_q$ as

$$V^{\underline{a}}_q = -4\Big[(E_{q1}\bar{E}_{p2}) + (\bar{E}_{q1}E_{p2})\Big](\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p2}) + W^{\underline{a}}_q - W^{\underline{a}}_p \tag{3.19}$$

where

$$W^{\underline{a}}_q = (E_{q2}\Gamma^{\underline{ab}}\bar{E}_{q2})E_{+\underline{b}} - [(E_{2q}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{2q}) - (\bar{E}_{2q}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{2q})]A_{+}$$

From eq. (3.19), if $q \neq p$ one has

$$V^{\underline{a}}_q = W^{\underline{a}}_q - W^{\underline{a}}_p$$

so that, for $q \neq p \neq r$,

$$V^{\underline{a}}_p + V^{\underline{a}}_q = 0 = V^{\underline{a}}_q + V^{\underline{a}}_r$$

and therefore $V^{\underline{a}}_q = 0$. Then, considering eq. (3.19) for $q = p$, one obtains eq. (3.17). Notice that in this derivation n is required to be ≥ 3.

An interesting consequence of eq. (3.17) is that the vectors

$$L^{\underline{a}}_{q\pm} = \sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\pm}(E_{q\alpha}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E_{q\beta}) \tag{3.20}$$

are proportional. Indeed they are light–like and moreover, from the cyclic identity and eq. (3.12),

$$L^{\underline{a}}_{q+}L_{q-,\underline{a}} = 0$$

In the same way, also $\bar{L}^{\underline{a}}_{q+} = (\bar{E}_{q1}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{q1})$ and $\bar{L}^{\underline{a}}_{q-} = (\bar{E}_{q2}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{q2})$ are proportional.

Moreover the proportionality coefficients as well as the scalar products $L^{\underline{a}}_{q\pm}\bar{L}_{q\pm\underline{a}}$ are independent from q. This can be seen by expressing the metric components g_{ab} in eq. (3.5) in terms of $L^{\underline{a}}_{q\pm}$, $\bar{L}^{\underline{a}}_{q\pm}$. Indeed, from eqs. (2.10), $L^{\underline{a}}_{q\pm}$ and $\bar{L}^{\underline{a}}_{\pm}$ are q–independent.
Then we can write

$$L_{q\pm}^{\underline{a}} = \alpha_{\pm} L^{\underline{a}} \qquad \bar{L}_{q\pm}^{\underline{a}} = \beta_{\pm} \bar{L}^{\underline{a}} \tag{3.21}$$

and we can set, without restriction, $|det\ A| = 1$, where A is the invertible matrix $A = \binom{\alpha_+ \ \beta_+}{\alpha_- \ \beta_-}$.
It is also convenient to write det g in terms of these vectors. One gets

$$-det\ g = (L^{\underline{a}} \bar{L}_{\underline{a}})^2 \tag{3.22}$$

At this point, it is immediate to verify eqs. (3.10) and (3.11) and then to deduce eq. (3.12).

Restricting ourselves to the case $n = 8$, let us notice that the 16×16 matrix $E_{q\alpha}^{(+)\underline{\hat{\alpha}}} \equiv (E_{q\alpha}^{(+)\underline{\alpha}}, \bar{E}^{(+)}_{q\alpha\underline{\alpha}})$, is invertible.

Indeed its inverse is $F_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}}^{(+)q\alpha} = (F_{\underline{\alpha}}^{(+)q\alpha}, \bar{F}^{(+)q\alpha\underline{\alpha}})$ where

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\underline{\alpha}}^{(+)q\alpha} &= \frac{1}{16} \sigma_a^{\alpha\beta} g^{ab} E_b^{\underline{a}} (\Gamma_{\underline{a}} E_\beta^q)_{\underline{\alpha}} \\ \bar{F}^{(+)q\alpha\underline{\alpha}} &= \frac{1}{16} (\sigma_a)^{\alpha\beta} g^{ab} E_b^{\underline{a}} (\Gamma_{\underline{a}} \bar{E}_\beta^q)^{\underline{\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

so that the projector $Q^{(+)}$ can be rewritten as

$$Q_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}}^{(+)\underline{\hat{\beta}}} = F_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}}^{(+)q\alpha} E_{q\alpha}^{(+)\underline{\hat{\beta}}} \tag{3.23}$$

Now we are ready to prove Weyl triviality for the 2–superform B.

Weyl triviality asserts that it is possible to modify B by adding to it a gauge and Lorentz invariant 2–superform K,

$$\tilde{B} = B + K \tag{3.24}$$

in such a way that the differential of $\tilde{B}$ restricted to the superworldsheet $\mathcal{M}$ vanishes. In our case

$$K = \frac{1}{4n} e^+ e^- \left(E_-^{\underline{A}} \sigma_+^{\alpha\beta} - E_+^{\underline{A}} \sigma_-^{\alpha\beta} \right) E_{q\alpha}^{\underline{B}} E_\beta^{q\underline{C}} H_{\underline{CBA}} \tag{3.25}$$

Using the twistor constraints and the SUGRA constraints for H, as well as eqs.(3.10), (3.22), K can be rewritten as

$$K = \frac{1}{2} e^+ e^- (-det\ g)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{2} d\xi^1\ d\xi^2 (-det\ G)^{1/2} \tag{3.26}$$

where

$$G_{mn} = E^{\underline{a}}_{m}\eta_{\underline{ab}}E^{\underline{b}}_{n} \tag{3.27}$$

By taking the differential of eq. (3.25) (and using eq. (3.10)) one has

$$\begin{aligned} dK = {} & \frac{1}{2}\Big[(\sigma^{+})_{\alpha\beta}e^{-}e^{\alpha}_{q}e^{q\beta} - (\sigma^{-})_{\alpha\beta}e^{+}e^{\alpha}_{q}e^{q\beta}\Big](-det\ g)^{1/2} + \\ & + e^{+}e^{-}e^{q\alpha}\Big[(E^{\underline{a}}_{+}E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{-} - E^{\underline{a}}_{-}E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{+})\Gamma_{\underline{a\alpha\beta}}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{q\alpha} - (E^{\underline{a}}_{+}\bar{E}_{-\underline{\alpha}} - (E^{\underline{a}}_{-}\bar{E}_{+\underline{\alpha}})\Gamma^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}_{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{q\alpha\underline{\beta}}\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

To get eq. (3.28) one should remark that the contributions to dK involving the components $\mathcal{T}^{q\alpha}_{p\beta,r\gamma}$ and $T^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\beta\gamma}}, T^{\underline{\beta\gamma}}_{\underline{\alpha}}$ of the worldsheet and target space torsions, vanish. Indeed, if for instance one considers the term

$$C = E^{\underline{a}}_{-}\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{+}\Delta_{r\gamma}(E_{q\alpha}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}E^{q}_{\beta})$$

which arise in the calculation of dK one gets

$$C = E^{\underline{a}}_{-}(E_{+}\Gamma^{a}E_{r\gamma}) + E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{-}\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{+}\Big[\mathcal{T}^{\delta}_{(r\gamma,q\alpha,p}(\sigma^{+})_{\beta)\delta}L^{\underline{a}}_{+} + E^{\underline{\gamma}}_{r\gamma}E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{q\alpha}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{p\beta}T^{\underline{\delta}}_{(\underline{\gamma\beta}}\Gamma^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\alpha})\delta}\Big]\delta^{pq}$$

and the second term vanish due to the Bianchi identities eqs. (2.2), (2.6).
On the other hand the pull back of dB is

$$\begin{aligned} dB\mid_{\mathcal{M}} = {} & \Big\{\frac{1}{2}e^{q\alpha}e^{p\beta}(e^{+}E^{\underline{a}}_{+} + e^{-}E^{\underline{a}}_{-})\Big[(E_{q\alpha}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}E_{p\beta}) - (\bar{E}_{q\alpha}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p\beta})\Big] - \\ & - e^{q\alpha}e^{+}e^{-}\Big[E^{\underline{a}}_{+}\Big((E_{-}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}E_{q\alpha}) - (\bar{E}_{-}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{q\alpha})\Big) - E^{\underline{a}}_{-}\Big((E_{+}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}E_{q\alpha}) - (\bar{E}_{+}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}E_{q\alpha})\Big)\Big]\Big\}\Big|_{\mathcal{M}} \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

However, from eqs. (2.10), (3.21), (3.22) and the cyclic identity, one has

$$E^{\underline{a}}_{\pm}\Big[(E_{q\alpha}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}E_{p\beta}) - (\bar{E}_{q\alpha}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\bar{E}_{p\beta})\Big] = \pm(-det\ g)^{1/2}\delta_{qp}(\sigma_{\pm})_{\alpha\beta}$$

so that the r.h.s. of eqs. (3.28) and (3.29) are equal and opposite and Weyl triviality is proved.

4 – ACTION AND FIELD EQUATIONS

It follows from Weyl triviality that the action

$$I^{(B)} = \alpha\int_{\mathcal{M}_0}\tilde{B} \tag{4.1}$$

is invariant under n–extended worldsheet supersymmetry. Here $\mathcal{M}_0$ is the slide of $\mathcal{M}$ at $\eta^{qn} = 0$, the constant α is the string tension and

$$\tilde{B} = B + \frac{1}{4n} e^+ e^- \epsilon^{ab} \sigma_b^{\alpha\beta} E_{q\alpha}^{\underline{A}} E_\beta^{q\underline{B}} E_a^C H_{\underline{CBA}} \tag{4.2}$$

Indeed, if δ_ϵ denotes the variation under the infinitesimal local supersymmetry transformation $\zeta^M \to \zeta^M + \epsilon^{q\alpha}(\zeta) e_{q\alpha}^M$ and i_ϵ denotes the contraction of a (super)form with the vector $\epsilon^{q\alpha} e_{q\alpha}^M$, one has

$$\delta_\epsilon \tilde{B} = d i_\epsilon \tilde{B} + i_\epsilon d\tilde{B} = d i_\epsilon \tilde{B}$$

so that $\delta_\epsilon I^{(B)} = 0$.

The action $I^{(B)}$ must be added to the action $I^{(C)}$ in eq. (2.12). Alternatively one can add to $I^{(C)}$ the action [9]

$$I'^{(B)} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} P^{MN} (\tilde{B}_{NM} - \partial_N Q_M) \tag{4.3}$$

where P^{MN} are new, Grassmann antisymmetric, lagrangian multipliers. The local invariance, that follows from Weyl triviality,

$$\delta P^{MN} = \partial_L \Lambda^{LMN},$$

Λ^{LMN} being a Grassmann antisymmetric superfield, allows to gauge to zero all the components of P^{MN} excepting the highest one [9][19].

$$P^{m\ell} = \alpha (\eta^2)^n \epsilon^{m\ell}$$

where

$$\eta^2 = \frac{1}{2n} (\eta^{q\mu} \eta_q^\nu \epsilon_{\mu\nu})$$

so that eq. (4.1) is recovered.

In order to implement the worldsheet supervielbeins and torsion constraints one can add to the action $I^{(B)} + I^{(C)}$ the further term

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(T)} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{e} \Big[& K_a^{q\alpha,p\beta} \Big(\mathcal{T}_{q\alpha,p\beta}^a - \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a \delta_{qp} \Big) + K_{q\alpha}^{p\beta} \Big(e_{p\beta} e^{q\alpha} - \delta_p^q \delta_\beta^\alpha \Big) + \\ & + K_a^b (e_b e^a - \delta_b^a) + K_{q\alpha}^b (e_b e^{q\alpha}) + K_a^{p\beta} (e_{p\beta} e^a) \Big] \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Finally let us recall that by a shift of the lagrangian multipliers $P^{\alpha q}_{\underline{a}}$, $I^{(B)}$ can be rewritten as

$$I^{(B)} = \int d^2\xi \Big(\epsilon^{mn} B_{mn} + (-det\ G)^{1/2}\Big) \tag{4.5}$$

and reduces to a form of the standard action of the G.S., type IIA, superstring, σ–model.

In conclusion the twistor–like formulation of the type II A, superstring σ–model is described by the following action

$$I = \int d^2\xi [\epsilon^{mn} B_{mn} + (-det\ G)^{1/2}] + \int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{e} \Big[P^{q\alpha}_{\underline{a}} E^{\underline{a}}_{q\alpha} + Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}} \Big((E_{(q\alpha} \bar{E}_{p\beta)}) \Big) \Big] + I^{(T)} \tag{4.6}$$

(Here $P^{q\alpha}$ and $Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}$ denote the shifted lagrangian multipliers).

The relevant field equations are

$$\Delta_{q\alpha} P^{q\alpha}_{\underline{a}} + (\eta^2)^n \mathcal{L}_{\underline{a}} = 0 \tag{4.7}$$

$$P^{q\alpha}_{\underline{a}} (\Gamma^{\underline{a}} E_{q\alpha})_{\underline{\alpha}} - \Delta_{q\alpha} (Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}} \bar{E}_{p\beta\underline{\alpha}}) + (\eta^2)^n \mathcal{L}_{\underline{\alpha}} = 0 \tag{4.8}$$

$$P^{q\alpha}_{\underline{a}} (\Gamma^{\underline{a}} \bar{E}_{q\alpha})^{\underline{\alpha}} - \Delta_{q\alpha} (Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}} E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{p\beta}) + (\eta^2)^n \mathcal{L}^{\underline{\alpha}} = 0 \tag{4.9}$$

$$P^{q\alpha}_{\underline{a}} E^{\underline{a}}_{b} + Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}} [(E_b \bar{E}_{p\beta}) + (\bar{E}_b E_{p\beta})] - \Delta_{p\beta} K^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}_{b} = 0 \tag{4.10}$$

$$K^{p\beta}_{q\alpha} = 0 = K^{b}_{a}; \qquad K^{b}_{q\alpha} = 0 \tag{4.11}$$

$$K^{q\alpha}_{a} = \Delta_{p\beta} K^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}_{a} \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}^{\underline{A}} = E^{\underline{A}}_{\underline{M}} \frac{\delta I^{(B)}}{\delta Z^{\underline{M}}} = 0 \tag{4.13}$$

are the standard superstring field equations. Moreover the only non vanishing components of $K^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}_{a}$ are $K^{\{q1,p1\}}_{+}$ and $K^{\{q2,p2\}}_{-}$ symmetric and traceless in q, p.

The action I is invariant not only under diffeomorphisms and n–extended local supersymmetry but also under the generalized superWeyl transformations

$$e'^{\pm} = e^{\Lambda(\zeta)} e^{\pm}$$

$$e'^{q\alpha} = e^{\Lambda(\zeta)/2} e^{q\alpha} + e^{\pm} \Lambda^{q\alpha}_{\pm}(\zeta)$$

supplemented with corresponding transformations of D_A and a rescaling of the lagrangian multipliers. In addition I is invariant under the following local transformations of the lagrangian multipliers

$$\delta^{(1)} P^{q\alpha\ \underline{a}} = \Delta_{p\beta} \Lambda^{\{q\alpha,p\beta,r\gamma,s\delta\}}_{\underline{b}} \left(\bar{E}_{r\gamma} \Gamma^{\underline{ba}} E_{s\delta} \right) + \dots \tag{4.14a}$$

$$\delta^{(1)} Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}} = \Lambda^{\{q\alpha,p\beta,r\gamma,s\delta\}}_{\underline{b}} \left[(E_{r\gamma} \Gamma^{\underline{b}} E_{s\delta}) - (\bar{E}_{r\gamma} \Gamma^{\underline{b}} \bar{E}_{s\delta}) \right] + ... \tag{4.14b}$$

$$\delta^{(2)} Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}} = \Delta_{\gamma r} \Lambda^{\{q\alpha,p\beta,r\gamma\}} + ... \tag{4.14c}$$

$$\delta^{(3)} P^{q\alpha}_{\underline{a}} = \Delta_{p\beta} \left[\Delta_{r\gamma} \Lambda^{r\gamma\{q,p\}}_{\{a,b\}} (\sigma^b)^{\alpha\beta}\ g^{af} E_{f\underline{a}} \right] + \cdots \tag{4.15}$$

$$\delta^{(4)} K^{q\alpha,p\beta}_{a} = \Delta_{r\gamma} \Lambda^{\{r,q,p\}}_{\{a,b,c\}\delta} (\sigma^b)^{\alpha\beta} (\sigma^c)^{\gamma\delta} + ... \tag{4.16}$$

Indices between curly brackets are symmetrized and traceless and in particular $\Lambda^{\{q\alpha,p\beta,r\gamma,s\delta\}}_{\underline{b}}$ are superfields symmetric in $q\alpha, p\beta, r\gamma, s\delta$ and traceless in $q, p, r, s,$. The dots in eqs. (4.14a), (4.14c) and (4.15) denote suitable terms proportional to the gauge parameters Λ'^s and/or $\mathcal{T}^{r\gamma}_{q\alpha,p\beta}$. The invariance under (4.14) and (4.16) follows immediately from the cyclic identity and the torsion Bianchi identity respectively. That under (4.15) is less obvious. It encodes the fact that the spinor like derivatives of the components of the constraints (2.10) parallel to $E_{a\underline{a}}$ and traceless in q, p and of the constraints (2.11) traceless in q, p are not new constraints but are fulfilled automatically once the constraints (2.9), (2.10), (2.11) are satisfied. This can be shown easy using eqs. (3.13) and (3.28).

Coming back to the field equations (4.7)–(4.10), eq. (4.7) implies

$$P^{q\alpha}_{\underline{a}} = \Delta_{p\beta} \left[\bar{Q}^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}_{\underline{a}} + (\eta^2)^n \delta^{qp} \sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{a} p^{a}_{\underline{a}} \right] \tag{4.17}$$

Moreover from eqs, (4.8) and (4.9) one can see that the superfields $\Delta_{p\beta}\bar{Q}_{\underline{a}}^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}$ and $Q^{\{q\alpha,p\beta\}}$ have the same structure of the r.h.s. of eqs. (4.14) and (4.15) so that they can be gauged away. In addition eqs. (4.8) and (4.5) require that the vectors $p_{\underline{a}}^{\pm}$ in eq. (4.17) are proportional both to $L^{\underline{a}}$ and to $\bar{L}^{\underline{a}}$ so that they vanish. Then eq. (4.10) together with eq. (4.16), allows to eliminate $K_{a}^{q\alpha,p\beta}$ as well. Now eqs. (4.7), (4.8), (4.9) reduce to the classical field equations of the standard, Green–Schwarz, type IIA superstring σ–model

$$\mathcal{L}_{\underline{a}} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\underline{\alpha}} = 0 = \mathcal{L}^{\underline{\alpha}}$$

It is worth mentioning that the components of the supervielbeins and $SO(1,1)\otimes SO(n)$ connection are not independent dynamical variables. Indeed $\omega_A{}^B$ can be expressed in terms of the supervielbeins by means of conventional torsion constraints and the superdiffeomorphisms and the other local invariances allow to gauge away almost all supervielbeins components. Moreover the (derivatives of the) twistor constraints allow to express the remaining components such as the gravitino fields (as well as the higher components of the superfields Z^M) in terms of the leading components of the “higher” superfields and of the twistor fields.

Let us conclude by noticing explicitly a fact already anticipated in the introduction. The induced metric

$$g_{ab} = E_a^{\underline{a}}\eta_{\underline{ab}}E_b^{\underline{b}}$$

is not diagonal and therefore the Virasoro constraints are not fulfilled in the frame where the n–extended supersymmetry is manifest. Nevertheless, it is easy to recover the frame where the Virasoro constraints hold recalling eqs. (3.20)–(3.22). Indeed eqs. (2.10 a,b) can be rewritten in the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} E_+^{\underline{a}} \\ E_-^{\underline{a}} \end{pmatrix} \qquad = A\begin{pmatrix} L^{\underline{a}} \\ \bar{L}^{\underline{a}} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then the required frame is

$$\begin{pmatrix} e'_+ \\ e'_- \end{pmatrix} = A^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} e_+ \\ e_- \end{pmatrix}$$

In this frame $E_+^{\prime\underline{a}} = L^{\underline{a}}$ and $E_-^{\prime\underline{a}} = \bar{L}^{\underline{a}}$ so that

$$E'^{\underline{a}}_{+}E'_{+\underline{a}} = 0 = E'^{\underline{a}}_{-}E'_{-\underline{a}}$$

However in this frame the worldsheet supersymmetry is hidden.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to D. Sorokin for helpful comments and discussions and to E. Sezgin for useful comunications.

Appendix

In the target space the tangent Minkowski metrics $\hat{\eta}_{\underline{\hat{a}\hat{b}}}$ in D=11 and $\eta_{\underline{ab}}$ in D=10 are

$$\hat{\eta}_{\underline{00}} = -\hat{\eta}_{\underline{a}'\underline{a}'} = -\hat{\eta}_{\underline{1010}} = 1; \quad \eta_{\underline{00}} = -\eta_{\underline{a}'\underline{a}'} = 1$$

where

$$\underline{\hat{a}} = (\underline{a}, \underline{10}) \ ; \ \underline{a} = (\underline{0}, \underline{a}') \text{ and } \underline{a}' = 1, ...9$$

The Dirac matrices in D=11 are 32×32 matrices for which we shall choose the representation

$$\hat{\gamma}^{\underline{0}} = \mathbf{1}_{16} \otimes \tau_2; \quad \hat{\gamma}^{\underline{a}'} = (-i)\gamma^{a'} \otimes \tau_1; \quad \hat{\gamma}^{\underline{10}} = i\mathbf{1}_{16} \otimes \tau_3; \qquad (A1)$$

where $\tau_k, k = 1, 2, 3$ are the Pauli matrices and the nine real 16⊗16 matrices $\gamma^{\underline{a}'}$ satisfy the Clifford algebra.

The real and symmetric Γ–matrices are defined as

$$(\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{\hat{a}}})_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}} = i(\hat{\gamma}^{\underline{\hat{a}}}\hat{C})_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}}$$

where $\hat{C} = -i\mathbf{1}_{16} \otimes \tau_2$ is the charge conjugation matrix. The Γ–matrices satisfy the cyclic identity

$$(\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{\hat{a}}})_{(\underline{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}}(\hat{\Gamma}_{\underline{\hat{a}\hat{b}}})_{\underline{\hat{\gamma}\hat{\delta}})} = 0$$

and in the rapresentation (A1) are

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{0}} &= \mathbf{1}_{16} \otimes \mathbf{1}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix} \\
\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{a}'} &= \gamma^{\underline{a}'} \otimes \tau_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{\underline{a}'} & 0 \\ 0 & -\gamma^{\underline{a}'} \end{pmatrix} \\
\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{10}} &= \mathbf{1}_{16} \otimes \tau_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}
\qquad (A2)
$$

Similarly, we define

$$
(\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{\hat{a}}_1 \cdots \underline{\hat{a}}_k})_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}} = (i)^k (\hat{\gamma}^{[\underline{\hat{a}}_1} \cdots \hat{\gamma}^{\underline{\hat{a}}_k]} \hat{C})_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}}
$$

In particular

$$
\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{a}'\underline{b}'} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma^{[\underline{a}'}\gamma^{\underline{b}']} \\ -\gamma^{[\underline{a}'}\gamma^{\underline{b}']} & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{a}'\underline{10}} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{\underline{a}'} & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma^{\underline{a}'} \end{pmatrix}
$$

$$
\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{a}'\underline{0}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma^{\underline{a}'} \\ \gamma^{\underline{a}'} & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{010}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix} \qquad (A3)
$$

A Majorana spinor in D=11 reduces in D=10 to a couple of Weyl–Majorana in D=10 with opposite chiralities: $\hat{v}^{\underline{\hat{a}}} \equiv (v^{\underline{\alpha}}, \bar{v}_{\underline{\alpha}})$. Then from eqs. (A1)–(A3)

$$
(\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}} = \begin{pmatrix} (\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} & 0 \\ 0 & (\Gamma^{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}; \quad (\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{10}})_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1}_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} \\ \mathbf{1}^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}
$$

$$
(\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{ab}})_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\Gamma^{\underline{ab}})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} \\ (\Gamma^{\underline{ab}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (\hat{\Gamma}^{\underline{a10}})_{\underline{\hat{\alpha}}\underline{\hat{\beta}}} = \begin{pmatrix} (\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} & 0 \\ 0 & -(\Gamma^{a})^{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}
$$

$(\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}$ and $(\Gamma^{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}$ are the real and symmetric Γ–matrices in D=10, acting on chiral and antichiral spinors respectively. They satisfy the cyclic identities

$$
(\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}(\underline{\beta}}(\Gamma_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\gamma}\underline{\delta})} = 0 = (\Gamma^{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}(\underline{\beta}}(\Gamma_{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\gamma}\underline{\delta})}
$$

In the world manifold, the tangent Minkowski metrics $\hat{\eta}_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}$ in d=3 and η_{ab} in d=2 have again signature such that $\hat{\eta}_{00} = \eta_{00} = 1$, ($\hat{a} = 0, 1, 2$ and $a = 0, 1$). We denote $\hat{\sigma}^{\hat{a}}$ and σ^a the real and symmetric "Γ–matrices" in d=3 and in d=2 respectively (2×2 matrices in both cases). By choosing for the Dirac and charge conjugation matrices in d=3 the representation

$$
\hat{\gamma}^0 = \tau_2; \quad \hat{\gamma}^1 = -\tau_1; \quad \hat{\gamma}^2 = i\tau_3; \quad C = -i\tau_2
$$

we have

$$\hat{\sigma}^0 = \sigma^0 = 1; \hat{\sigma}^1 = \sigma^1 = \tau_3; \hat{\sigma}^2 = \sigma^\perp = \tau_1$$

Moreover we define

$$\sigma^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\sigma^0 \pm \sigma^1)$$

so that

$$\sigma^+ = \sigma_- = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad \sigma^- = \sigma_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

References

1] D.P. Sorokin, V.I. Tkakch and D.V. Volkov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 901;

D.P. Sorokin, V.I. Tkach, D.V. Volkov and A.A. Zheltukhin, Phys. Lett. **216B** (1989) 302.

2] D.P. Sorokin, Fortsch. Phys. **38** (1990) 302.

A.I. Gumenchuk and D.P. Sorokin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **51** (1990) 350;

V.A. Soroka, D.P. Sorokin, V.I. Tkach and D.V. Volkov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A7** (1992) 5977;

A.I. Pashnev and D.P. Sorokin, Class. Quantum. Grav. **10** (1993) 625.

3] D.V. Volkov and A.A. Zheltukhin, Letters in Math. Phys. **17** (1989) 141; Nucl. Phys. **B335** (1990) 723.

4] N. Berkovits, Phys. Lett. **232B** (1989) 184; **241B** (1990) 497; Nucl. Phys. **B350** (1991) 193; **B358** (1991) 169; **B395** (1993) 77.

5] M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. **266B** (1991) 312; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A7** (1992) 6013; S. Aoyama, P. Pasti and M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. **283B** (1992) 213; I. Bandos, D. Sorokin, M. Tonin and D. Volkov, Phys. Lett. **319B** (1993) 445; D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. **326** (1994) 84.

6] P. Howe and P. Townsend, Phys. Lett. **259B** (1991) 285.

F. Delduc and E. Sokatchev, Class. Quantum Grav. **9** (1991) 361;

A. Galperin and E. Sokatchev, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 714.

7] E.A. Ivanov and A.A. Kapustnikov, Phys. Lett. **267B** (1991) 175;

F. Delduc, E. Ivanov and E. Sokatchev, Nucl. Phys. **B384** (1992) 334;

A.S. Galperin, P.S. Howe and K.S. Stelle, Nucl. Phys. **B368** (1992) 281;

F. Delduc, A. Galperin and E. Sokatchev, Nucl. Phys. **B368** (1992) 143.

8] J.P. Gauntlett, Phys. Lett. **272B** (1991) 25.

9] F. Delduc, A. Galperin, P. Howe and E. Sokatchev, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1992) 578.

10] V. Chikalov and A. Pashnev, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A8** (1993) 285.

11] A. Galperin and E. Sokatchev, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993), 4810.

12] P. Pasti and M. Tonin, Nucl. Phys. **B418** (1994) 337.

13] I. Bandos, M. Cederwall, D. Sorokin and D. Volkov, preprint ITP-94-10 Göteborg (1994).

14] E. Bergsoeff and E. Sezgin, preprint CTP TAMO-67/93, hep–th/9312168

15] R. Penrose, J. Math. Phys. **8** (1967) 345; R. Penrose and M.A.H. MacCallum, Phys. Rep. **6** (1972) 241 and refs. therein. E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1986) 245;

L.L. Chau and B. Milewski, Phys. Lett. **216B** 81989) 330;

L.L. Chau and C.S. Lim, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A4** (1989) 3819;

J.A. Shapiro and C.C. Taylor, Phys. Rep. **191** (1990) 221;

A. Ferber, Nucl. Phys. **B132** (1978) 55;

T. Shirafuji, Progr. Theor. Phys. **70** (1983) 18;

A.K.H. Bengston et al., Phys. Rev. **36D** (1987) 1786;

I. Bengtsson and M. Cederwall, Nucl. Phys. **B302** (1988) 81;

Y. Eisenberg and S. Solomon, Nucl. Phys. **B309** (1988) 709;

M. Plyushchay, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 1827.

D.B. Fairlie and C.M. Monogue, Phys. Rev. **D36** (1987) 475.

16] E. Sokatchev, Class. Quantum Grav. **4** (1988) 237;

E. Nissimov, S. Pacheva and S. Solomon, Nucl. Phys. **B296** (1988) 492; **B297** (1988) 349; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A4** (1989) 737.

R.E. Kallosh and M.A. Rahmanov, Phys. Lett. **209B** (1988) 233; **214B** (1988) 549;

I.A. Bandos, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **51** (1990) 906;

I.A. Bandos and A.A. Zheltukhin, Sov. Phys. JETP Lett. **51** (1990) 547; JETP Lett. **54** (1991) 421; JETP Lett. **55** (1992) 81; Phys. Lett. **261B** (1991) 245; Theor. Math. Phys. **88** (1991) 358; Fortsch. der Phys. **41** (1993) 619; Phys. Lett. **288B** (1992) 77; Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **56** (1993) 198; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A8** (1993) 1081.

17] M.J. Duff, P.S. Howe, T. Inami and K.S. Stelle, Phys. Lett. **191B** (1987) 70;

A. Achúcarro, P. Kapusta and K.S. Stelle **232B** (1989) 302.

[18] J. Carr, S.J. Gates jr. and R. Oerter, Phys. Lett. **189B** (1987) 68.

19] J.A. De Azcàrraga, J.M. Izquierdo and P.K. Towsend, Phys. Rev. **D45** (1992) 3321;

P.K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. **277B** (1992) 285.

E. Bergshoeff, L.A.J. London and P.K. Townsend. Class. Quantum Grav. **9** (1992) 2545.